



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

unable to tolerate the respect entertained for Washington and Hamilton by M'Henry, Pickering, and Wolcott, dismissed these gentlemen from his cabinet on the very eve of the presidential election" (p. 396). Hamilton's relations with Miranda are not discussed, although we are assured that he had no "ambitions of a Napoleonic career". The discussion of the pamphlet which Hamilton issued in 1800 against Adams is presented in such a confused manner that it is impossible to say whether the author justifies or condemns the action of his subject in the matter (p. 402). We are undoubtedly told that it was a blunder, but we are also told that in doing it Hamilton was justified by the action of Adams toward him, and that his own action was not due to "any desire to wipe out old scores" (p. 402). And yet the author must have known when he wrote that Hamilton on May 10, 1800, said of Adams that he would never again be responsible for Adams's actions, "even though the consequences should be the election of Jefferson".

The statements pointed out are but typical of the spirit in which the book is written. It is a good echo of John C. Hamilton's large work and a worthy companion of Percy Greg's *History of the United States*.

What has been said is not to be understood as meaning that the book does not contain many acceptable statements of facts in Hamilton's life. The style is usually good, although it is not always very clear. There is no lack of striking phrases and characterizations. But in every important matter which has aroused controversy there is a singular lack of the critical spirit. The foot-notes indicate a narrow range of investigation and too close a following of the pro-Hamiltonian sources of information.

JOHN SPENCER BASSETT.

*The Election of Senators.* By GEORGE H. HAYNES, Ph.D. [American Public Problems, edited by RALPH CURTIS RINGWALT.] (New York: Henry Holt and Company. 1906. Pp. xi, 295.)

THIS volume, the second in a series entitled "American Public Problems", is a veritable mine of information in regard to the origin and practical workings of the provisions of the Constitution relating to the election of Federal senators. It contains also a complete résumé of the movement of recent years for the popular control over the choice of senators, together with a comprehensive and impartial presentation of the arguments on both sides of this practical question. The timeliness of this discussion is apparent in view of the fact that within the past fifteen years thirty-one states—more than the two-thirds required by the Constitution—have made formal application to Congress for the submission of an amendment to secure the election of senators by the direct vote of the people. Moreover an Interstate Convention has been called by the Iowa Legislature to meet at Des Moines, December 5, 1906, for the sole purpose of furthering this same object. At least twenty-eight states have signified their intention to participate in its deliberations. Its conclusions will be a matter of public record before the publication of this review.

The author is thoroughly impressed with the importance of his subject, owing to the position which the Senate has secured in our system as "the dominant branch of Congress, the controlling influence in the government". "Whether the Senate be regarded as the sheet anchor of the republic in the troubled seas of democracy, or as the stronghold of corporate interests—as the country's only safeguard, or as its chief menace—the question becomes one of paramount importance: how do men come to their membership in this overpowering body?" To the answer of this question Dr. Haynes devotes the first portion of his volume. After presenting the considerations which led "the fathers" to place the election in the control of the state legislatures, and giving an account of the act of 1866 for the regulation of senatorial elections, he reviews the unsatisfactory results of the system, the most obvious of which has been the serious deadlocks in at least one-half of the states within the past fifteen years.

"The personnel" of the Senate during five recent Congresses is subjected to a searching analysis. With the assistance of five "close observers" Dr. Haynes attempts an interesting classification of the senators. As a result of this examination only seventeen fall within the class notable for their "statesmanship", while "one senator out of every three owes his election to his personal wealth, to his being the candidate satisfactory to . . . the 'System,' or to his expertness in political manipulation". These conclusions simply confirm the current belief that there has been a general decline during the last half-century in the ability, fidelity, integrity, and independence of the members of the Upper House. Owing to the dissatisfaction with both the method of election and the resulting choice of men, the past two decades have witnessed a significant movement for the popular control of senatorial elections. Chapters v. and vi. show that this movement found expression in two ways, either through "a loose construction of the present law, or in accordance with a constitutional amendment" (p. viii). The first method, that of consulting the people in advance of the election by the legislature, has been adopted so fully that in almost one-third of the states it amounts to an unwritten amendment, as the election of senators has in effect ceased to be indirect. This has been accomplished by several methods, through the party convention nominating the candidate, by the direct primary system, and by ballot at the regular state elections. The rapid extension of the primary system to other states would make it possible for this system to become general.

The inherent weakness of this method of control both in theory and in the light of experience has strengthened the demand for a Constitutional amendment. Five times between 1893 and 1902 has such a proposition received the approval of the House of Representatives, only to encounter the seemingly insurmountable objection of the Senate. In the face of this obstruction there has been, since 1899, a significant movement on the part of the state legislatures to demand the calling

of a national constitutional convention to prepare the amendment; no less than twenty states having made application to Congress. If, as a result of the Interstate Convention at Des Moines previously referred to, the necessary two-thirds majority of the state legislatures shall be secured—as now seems probable—what will follow? Will the Senate still attempt to block the way, or will it permit recourse to the hitherto untried method of proposing amendments? Will it raise technical objections of procedure? For example, what are the time limits within which the application of two-thirds of the states must be received to make the calling of the convention obligatory? This is not discussed by Dr. Haynes, but it was under consideration by the Senate Committee on Elections in 1902. Some of the members held that the memorials must be passed during the life of the Congress to which they were addressed. By others it was urged that the applications needed only to be reasonably contemporaneous. The uncertainty of this point as well as other questions of interpretation that have arisen in the past suggests the desirability of regulating by law the whole matter of procedure under the provisions of Article V.

What are the advantages of the proposed change? After a full and sympathetic marshalling of the arguments for and against, the author attempts to forecast the probable effectiveness of popular election. He believes that it would improve the character of the Senate, although this belief does not amount to a conviction; "it is best," he warns us (p. 267), "not to entertain too optimistic anticipations." "The lowering of the tone in the Senate" cannot "be attributed solely to the method of election . . . but to general influences which have lowered and commercialized American politics" (*ibid.*). On the other hand, he believes that "the decisive advantages of the change . . . would be found in its effects . . . upon the individual States" (pp. 268-269).

This work may be commended as a scholarly, impartial, and rational discussion of a great national problem.

HERMAN V. AMES.

*The Legislative History of Naturalization in the United States From the Revolutionary War to 1861.* By FRANK GEORGE FRANKLIN, Ph.D., Professor of History and Political Science in the University of the Pacific. (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. 1906. Pp. ix, 308.)

SINCE 1861 there have been about a dozen laws passed on the subject of naturalization, beginning with the act of July 17, 1862, which permitted the naturalization of honorably discharged soldiers after a residence in the United States of one year, and ending with the momentous act of June 29, 1906, which for the first time put supervision of naturalization in the hands of the federal government. Mr. Franklin's book was written before this act was passed, but it ought to have been brought up to date. The interesting chapter on "Expatriation", for